REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. No claims have been canceled, amended or added in this reply. Hence, Claims 1-11 and 13-14 are pending in this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed May 29, 2008 are addressed hereinafter.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 8-11 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Miida*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049839, in view of *Dunmore et al.* (U.S. 7,302,444). (Office Action, page 3) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for processing network device status data and recites:

"a storage device comprising configuration data stored thereon, wherein **the configuration data indicates both:**
> **a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices,**
>> **wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices, and**
> how to convert network device status data that conforms to a first data format into each of the data formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices;
a conversion mechanism configured to
> process the network device status data that conforms to the first data format, and
> **generate, based upon the configuration data and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices, wherein the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices."**

The Office Action concedes that *Miida* fails to teach or suggest a "**configuration data, stored in a storage device, indicating a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the**

plurality of recipient devices, generate, based upon the configuration data [...] report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices, and that **the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices."** (Office Action, page 4) However, the Office Action states that because *Dunmore* discloses **a database capable of storing each recipient's format information in order to forward reports with respect to the format saved within and for forwarding reports to specific recipients from a plurality of recipients** (Dunmore, Abstract, column 5, lines 40-49), it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of storing each recipient's format information, within the reporting element of *Miida* for the purpose of delivering network reports to different recipients efficiently. (Office Action, page 4) This respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not taught or suggested in *Dunmore* and *Miida,* individually or in combination. For example, *Dunmore* and *Miida*, individually or in combination, fail to describe **"configuration data, stored in a storage device, indicating a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices."**

Dunmore describes a system for generating data reports in user-specified formats. *Dunmore's* user can specify an output format of a report, have the report data formatted according to the specified format, and have the report output in the specified format. *Dunmore's* user may configure and specify the specific format from a number of different data input terminal devices, and have the same specific format used to output the report data on a number of different output devices. Also, two or more *Dunmore's* users may specify the same data format from a number of different data input terminal devices and have the same specific format used to output the report data on a number of different output devices. Therefore, in *Dunmore,* the same data format may be configured and used on more than one device. Hence, in *Dunmore,* a data format is not unique to a particular device and is not "device-specific." Therefore, *Dunmore* does not teach or suggest "configuration data, stored in a storage device, <u>indicating a data format</u> supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, <u>wherein the data format</u> supported by each

of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices," as claimed.

Miida describes a system where network device status data are collected at an access center and provided to the users in a webpage format, an e-mail format, or both. In fact, any user in Miida may request the status data in any of those formats. For example, two or more users may access the access center website and have the status data presented in the webpage format on their separate terminals. Also, two or more users may receive the status data via an e-mail sent to the user e-mail accounts and have the status data presented in an e-mail format on their separate terminals. Therefore, in Miida, the same data format can be requested from a number of different input devices and, and can be utilized to output the report data on a number of different output devices (which can be the same as the user terminals). Thus, in Miida, a data format is not unique to a particular device and is not "device-specific." Therefore, Miida does not teach or suggest "configuration data, stored in a storage device, indicating a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices," as claimed.

Further, it would not have been obvious to combine the teaching of Dunmore with the teaching in Miida to describe "configuration data, stored in a storage device, indicating a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices" because neither one describes that "the data format supported by each of the recipient device is different than the data formats supported by any other recipient device." The data format is not unique to a particular recipient device in Dunmore and in Miida. In Dunmore, the same data format may be utilized by a number of recipient output devices. In Miida, the same data formats (webpage format and e-mail format) may be utilized by a number of user terminals. Therefore, it would not be obvious to combine the teaching of Dunmore with the teaching in Miida to describe "configuration data, stored in a storage device, indicating a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices."

In sharp contrast to *Dunmore* and *Miida*, Claim 1 recites that "**configuration data, stored in a storage device, indicating a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices.**" According to Claim 1, the data format supported by one of the recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by any other recipient device. According to Claim 1, each data format is unique to a particular recipient device.

Approach recited in Claim 1 has a number of benefits. As described in paragraph [0005] of applicants' specification, the approach where each of the data formats is supported by just one recipient device simplifies the management of the data output devices and their data formats. For example, if a particular data format changes, the change affects only one recipient device, and other devices are not impacted by the change. Further, if a particular vendor adds a new recipient device utilizing a new format, the new format has to be configured only on one (new) recipient device, and other devices are not impacted by the change. Therefore, configuring each network device to support data formats of other devices is impractical, particularly for large deployments. The solution where each of the data formats is different than the data formats supported by any other recipient devices is more appealing. (Specification, paragraph [0005])

Further, *Dunmore* and *Miida*, individually or in combination, fail to describe "**generate, based upon the configuration data [...] report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices,** and that **the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices.**"

As described above, *Dunmore's* data format is not specific to the recipient device. In *Dunmore's* the same data format may be entered by a number of users from a number of different devices who can have the same data format used by a number of different output devices. Therefore, *Dunmore* does not "generate, based upon the configuration data [...] report data that conforms to the data format, wherein the <u>data format</u> supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices <u>is different than the data formats</u> supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices," as claimed.

Further, *Dunmore's* report data is sent directly to the requestor, and is not "routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices based on the identification data that

uniquely identifies the recipient device," as claimed. *Dunmore* identifies the user based on providing a valid user ID, and sends the report to the output device also directly to an intended recipient device, specified by the user. The report is not routed from one recipient device to another recipient device until it reaches the intended recipient device. In *Dunmore*, no intermediate routing of the report from one recipient device to another takes place. Therefore, *Dunmore's* report data does not "generate, based upon the configuration data [...] report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices, and that the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices," as claimed.

As described above, in *Miida* any of the two available data formats (a webpage format, and e-mail format, or both) may be utilized by any of the recipient devices. Therefore, *Miida* does not "generate, based upon the configuration data [...] report data that conforms to the data format, wherein the <u>data format</u> supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices <u>is different than the data formats</u> supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices," as claimed.

Further, *Miida* does not route the report data to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices based on the recipient device identification data. *Miida* sends the report to the user who provided a valid user ID. The report is not routed from one recipient device to another recipient device until it reaches the intended recipient device. In *Miida,* the report is sent directly to the recipient device, and no intermediate routing of the report from one recipient device to another takes place. Therefore, *Miida* does not teach or suggest "generate, based upon the configuration data [...] report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices, and that the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices," as claimed.

Further, it would not have been obvious to combine the teaching of *Dunmore* with the teaching in *Miida* to describe "generate, based upon the configuration data [...] report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices, and that the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient

devices," because neither one describes that "the data format supported by each of the recipient device is different than the data formats supported by any other recipient device," and neither one "routes the report data to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices based on the identifier that identifies the intended recipient device," as claimed.

In sharp contrast to *Dunmore* and *Miida*, Claim 1 recites "**generate, based upon the configuration data […] report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices,** and that **the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices.**" According to Claim 1, the report data is generated based upon the configuration data and conforms to the data format that is unique to the recipient device, the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device, and the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices until it reaches the intended recipient device identifier by the identification data. This is not taught of suggested by *Dunmore* and *Miida*, individually or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 recites one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Dunmore* and *Miida*. Therefore, *Dunmore* and *Miida*, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the whole subject matter recited in Claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 2-6, 8-11 AND 14

Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 all depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations of Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 are patentable over *Miida* in view of *Dunmore* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 1. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 recite additional limitations that independently render them patentable over *Miida* in view of *Dunmore*.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Midda and *Dunmore*, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggests Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *Dunmore* and in further view of *Krishnaprasad et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099687 (hereinafter "*Krishnaprasad*"). It is respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida* and *Krishnaprasad* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter. Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida* and *Dunmore*. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not taught or suggested by *Krishnaprasad* and it is understood that the *Krishnaprasad* reference was not relied upon for teaching or suggesting these limitations, but rather the additional limitations of Claim 7 relating the XML schema conversion. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida, Dunmore* and *Krishnaprasad*.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *McGlade*, U.S. Patent No. 6,411,598. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida* and *McGlade*, considered alone or in combination, for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

Claim 13 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida*. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not taught or suggested by *McGlade* and it is understood that the *McGlade* reference was not relied upon for teaching or suggesting these limitations, but rather the additional limitations of Claim 13 relating to providing a notification if a receipt confirmation indicating receipt of the report data is not received from a particular recipient device. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida* and *McGlade*.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional fees, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: August 26, 2008

/MalgorzataAKulczycka#50496/
Malgorzata A. Kulczycka
Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110
Telephone:(408) 414-1228
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076